



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

been suggested by the first—it may be remarked that the *Samson* has, in proportion, as many repetitions of sound, structure, and sense, for the sake of vividness as some of Shakespeare's sonnets. Some of them, as in the following lines, are elaborate:

Fathers are wont to lay up for their Sons,
Thou for thy Son art bent to lay out all;
Sons wont to nurse their Parents in old age,
Thou in old age car'st how to nurse thy Son,
Made older then thy age through eye-sight lost.
(1485-9.)

Since examples may be found on every page it is needless to quote further. Apparently Milton uses the similar expressions *with an Asses Jaw* and *with other arms* in the same part of consecutive lines to emphasize the contrast between the equipment of Samson and Harapha that runs through the whole interview. The word *other*, in *with other arms*, should probably be read emphatically to bring out this contrast; Harapha means with his own military weapons, against which the rude arm of the unmilitary Samson would have availed little. In *wish other arms*, *other* does not bring out the contrast of Harapha's conventional military equipment with the improvised weapon of Samson, but means little more than 'better'; Harapha would have compelled the hard-pressed Danite to desire better weapons than the jaw-bone. Samson understands Harapha's phrase as a reference to the Philistine's own equipment, meaning 'with my soldierly arms,' for in his answer he takes up the very words when he sneers *thy gorgeous arms*; see lines 1119-1129. The Philistian giant in reply again contrasts his knightly equipment with that of the unchivalric Samson, this time with less assurance that the weapons of the trained soldier certainly will obtain him victory.

Thou durst not thus disparage glorious arms
Which greatest Heroes have in battel worn,
Their ornament and safety, had not spells
And black enchantments, some Magicians Art
Arm'd thee or charm'd thee strong. (1130-35.)

He declares further that Samson is

no worthy match

For valour to assail, nor by the sword
Of noble Warriour, so to stain his honour,
But by the Barber's razor best subdu'd (1164-7);

and answers a repeated challenge to combat:
To fight with thee no man of arms will deign (1226).

After the boastful Philistine departs the chorus shows how little military equipment avails against the champion of Heaven.

He all their Ammunition
And feats of War defeats
With plain Heroic magnitude of mind
And celestial vigour arm'd,
Their Armories and Magazines contemns,
Renders them useless (1277-82).

The reader of the drama has already been prepared to see how empty are Harapha's vaunts of his prowess in arms by the first speech of the chorus, telling how ridiculous the weaponless Samson made the arms of warriors; see lines 124-145. After these verses the assertion by Harapha that he 'should have forced Samson with other arms'—have overcome him easily with the arms of the warrior—is full of irony.

If the reading *with* gives a line in harmony with Milton's habits of language and versification, suitable to its context, of dramatic value, and of aid in bringing out clearly a thought important in the drama, there is no reason why the lover of Milton should not accept the authority of the only edition of *Samson Agonistes* printed during the lifetime of its author.

ALLAN H. GILBERT.

Cornell University.

THE THREE KINGS OF RACINE'S *ANDROMAQUE*, ACT V, SCENE 2

In a passage of the *Andromaque*, Hermione, daughter of Helen of Troy, frenzied with rage at the thought of the cruel wrong Pyrrhus is doing her by repudiating her in order to marry his captive Andromache, exclaims:

Quoi? sans qu'elle employât une seule prière,
Ma mère en sa faveur arma la Grèce entière?
Ses yeux pour leur querelle, en dix ans de combats,
Virent périr trois rois qu'ils ne connaissaient pas.
vv. 1477-1480.

The obvious difficulty of identifying from the natural sources (the Homeric poems) the "three kings" to whom Hermione refers is doubtless the reason why most modern texts of the *Andromaque* present *vingt rois* in place of *trois rois* found in the passage as cited above.¹ Even Paul Mesnard in the first print of his *Œuvres de J. Racine*, Grands Écrivains series, Paris, 1865-1873, while protesting against the arbitrary changes made in the text by previous authoritative editors like Geoffroy and Aimé Martin, still offers the reading *vingt rois*. But in his reprint of 1885-1888, in which he claims to have rigorously followed the text of the last edition published under Racine's supervision (1697) and to have collated it with all the previous editions, the *vingt* is replaced by *trois* (II, p. 119). He gives no variants and he makes no comment. As no one has questioned the fidelity with which Mesnard accomplished his task, it would seem that the reading given above must be accepted.

What basis, then, could Racine have had for saying so precisely that Helen saw three kings perish whom her eyes did not know? One would suppose that Helen could not have failed to meet the Trojan auxiliary kings at the court of Priam unless indeed, as in the case of Rhesus, they had been killed before they arrived there. On the other hand, it was a tradition universally accepted, at least in the seventeenth century, that she had been wooed by chiefs from all parts of Greece. Furthermore, in a well-known passage of the third book of the *Iliad*, Helen views from the walls of Troy the army of the Greeks drawn up in battle array; she names many of the foremost chieftains and adds that she recognizes "all" the rest. If verse 1480 is taken in its strictly literal sense: "her eyes saw three kings perish (i. e., get killed) whom they (her eyes) did not know," it would seem impossible for us, and Racine's resources were more limited than ours, to name with confidence any three kings who could qualify for the distinction accorded them in this passage.

¹ Cf., for example, Petit de Julleville, *Théâtre choisi de Racine*, Paris, 1906; and Warren, *Andromaque, Britannicus, Phèdre*. New York, Holt, 1903.

The zeal with which Racine studied the classics is well known. The notes which he wrote upon the margins of plays of the Greek tragedians and of the *Odyssey* and *Iliad* of Homer have been published in his works (Vol. VI). They throw no light upon this problem. But there was another account of the Trojan war which continued through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the vogue it had enjoyed during the middle ages. This was the *Ephemeris Belli Troiani*, composed, it is said, by Dictys of Crete in the course of the fourth century A. D. The British Museum contains an edition for which the date 1470 is postulated. Three other editions at least were made during the fifteenth century: Mediolani, 1477, Messanae, 1498, Venetiarum, 1499. In the sixteenth century, editions, either independent or in connection with other ancient historians, are numerous. Basileae, 1529, 1548, 1559, 1578; Lugduni, 1520, 1552, 1569, 1598; Parisiis, 1560; and in the seventeenth century, Paris, 1618, Amstelodami, 1631.² Such finally was the consideration which it enjoyed that it was included in the famous Delphin edition of the classics, Paris, 1680.³ It was translated into French by Ian de la Lande, Paris, 1556. Racine and his contemporaries must have been quite familiar with it.

In the second book, Dictys describes the preliminary skirmishes which the Greeks had to undergo when they first landed upon the Trojan shores. In one of these Protesilaus was killed. While the Greeks were performing the funeral rites over his body, one Cynus, whose kingdom was very near Troy, put them to flight. Achilles came to the rescue and killed this king and a great many of his followers.⁴ Thereupon a council was held and it was decided (*decernitur*), "*uti primum finitimas Troiae civitates cum parte exercitus adeant easque omni modo incursent*" (XIII).

² See Catalogue of the British Museum.

³ Cf. N. E. Griffin, *Dares and Dictys*, Johns Hopkins Dissertation, Baltimore, 1907, p. 17.

⁴ Dictys Cretensis, *op. cit.*, II, xii. The following citations are taken from D. C., *Ephemeris Belli Troiani*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1872, pp. 25 ff.

In pursuance with this policy, "Achilles . . . sumptis aliquot navibus Lesbum aggreditur ac sine ulla difficultate eam capit et Phorbanta loci ejus regem multa adversum Graecos hostiliter molitum interficit" (XVI). The country was ravaged, the submission of the neighboring peoples (*finitimi populi*) was received and then: "Achilles haud contentus eorum quae gesserat, Cilicas aggreditur, ibique Lyrnesum paucis diebus pugnando cepit. Interfecto dein Eetione, qui his locis imperitabat, magnis opibus naves replet . . . propere inde Pedasum expugnare ocepit, (Leleg)um urbem, sed eorum rex Brises ubi animadvertit in obsidendo saevire nostros, ratus nulla vi prohiberi hostes aut suos satis defendi posse, desperatione effugii salutisque attentis ceteris adversum hostes domum regressus laqueo interiit" (XVII). In the meantime Ajax Telamonius, who had been entrusted with the other division of the army designated for this work, "Thracum Cherronesum omni modo infestabat." Polymnestor, king of these regions, submitted, and Ajax filled his ships with spoils. Then, . . . "his actis Aiax iter ad Phrygas convertit ingressusque eorum regionem Teuthrantem dominum locorum solitario certamine interfecit ac post paucos dies expugnata atque incensa civitate magnam vim praedae trahit" (XVIII).

Five kings then, according to Dictys, perished during the expedition of the Greeks to recover Helen before the siege of Troy began. Now the first of these, Cynus, ruled, according to Dictys, over a state which was very near Troy ("cujus haud procul a Troia regnum"). The promptness of his attack upon the Greeks suggests close alliance with the Trojans. So it would be presumed that Helen had had an opportunity to make his acquaintance. Briseus fell a victim to his cowardice, or to his despair at seeing his daughter Hippodamia (Briseis) wrested from him by Achilles, as some traditions have it. At any rate he would hardly seem to deserve a place in this passage where Hermione, desperate over the conviction that she has no champion, recalls those who perished fighting in the battles caused by her

mother's beauty.⁵ In reading the second book of Dictys one is likely to be impressed by the fact that here are three kings, Phorbias, Eetion and Teuthras, who were actually killed in battle because of the trouble resulting from the abduction of Helen, and in places so remote⁶ from Troy, that they seem wholly detached from the main story and its heroine.

But the difficulty is that Hermione says: "My mother's eyes *saw* three kings perish whom they did not know." We may assume that Racine did not expect us to take the words of the overwrought Hermione too literally.⁷ The idea she means to convey is perhaps no more than: "My mother's eyes saw it come to pass that three kings whom she did not know perished in her cause." Or we may assume that Racine while reading the account of Dictys Cretensis had been struck by the prank which a perverse destiny played upon these three kings in having them killed in battles so completely outside the ken of her who caused them; that when he came to write this passage of his *Andromaque*, he had forgotten the circumstances, but was conscious that he "had seen somewhere" the statement that three kings, whom Helen could hardly have known, were killed during the expedition which the Greeks made to recover her. Metrical necessities may then have contributed to fix the statement in the form in which it stands.

COLBERT SEARLES.

Stanford University.

⁵ One might prefer, to be sure, to eliminate Eetion, king of the Cilices and father of Andromache, on the ground that he would have been called to Troy for the council of the old men called by Priam to decide whether Helen was to be returned to the Greeks (Dictys, I, viii).

⁶ Phorbias in Lesbos, Eetion at Lyrnessus, and Teuthras presumably in Teuthrania, his state. Lyrnessus and Teuthrania seem to have been located near the southeastern borders of Troas. Lesbos, Lyrnessus and Teuthrania were about equidistant from Troy.

⁷ In fact, taken literally, the verse comes near being absurd. Who could believe that even the eyes of Helen were keen enough to enable her to determine exactly whether all the kings whom she saw perish under armor in the *mêlées* before Troy were or were not included in the extensive list of her *kingly* acquaintances!